DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 623 CE 002 719

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth
TITLE Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences. Distinguised Lecture Series No. 2.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Graduate School.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; *Career Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Integrated Curriculum; Teacher Responsibility; Teachers; *Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

Career education consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work; vocational education, those through which one learns about a primary work role; and occupational education, those through which one learns to work in the world of paid employment. The three terms imply a progressive narrowing of purpose. The goals of career education are to make work possible, meaningful, and satisfying. Vocational education--skill acquisition--is a major part of the bedrock of career education. Integration requires academic teachers to recognize preparation for work as a basic goal of American education, and vocational teachers must find and emphasize the commonality of purpose in education that binds them with all other educators. The basic problem career education asks today's vocational educators to face is the problem of deciding to change; there are two basic choices: one would be to emphasize vocational education as preparation for primary work goals, abandoning the traditional criterion that it should lead to gainful employment and making industrial arts, home economics, agriculture, and experiences for the "college-bound" a basic part of vocational education. The other choice would be to label the field "occupational education." Mutual dependence requires change in both fields. (Author)

ED 099623

CAREER EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: AN APPROACH TO DEFINING DIFFERENCES

by
Kenneth Hoyt
Associate Commissioner
Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education
and
Professor of Education
University of Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Distinguished Lecture Series No. 2

1973 - 1974

CE 002 719

Sponsored by

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
and
Graduate School
The Ohio State University
164 W. 19th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education intends to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning and preparation. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of The Center's Distinguished Lecture Series in Career Development is to present major, critical thinkers who will persistently challenge and stimulate the university, its colleges, departments and The Center, and the national community to the ends that goals will be clarified, priorities will be more appropriately ordered, methods will be more effective, and human lives will be enriched.

The Ohio State University and The Center have selected Dr. Kenneth Hoyt as its second annual distinguished lecturer in the series. This presentation and lecture series represents an expansion of the many valuable research services provided by the University and The Center. The Center and The Ohio State University feel that the contributions of Dr. Hoyt and those to follow in the series, will provide an excellent means to further insure its mission of providing current and highly critical information to be used by educators at all levels for the improvement of existing and future educational programs.

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt is a native of the state of Iowa. He received the degrees of B.S. (1948) from the University of Maryland, M.S. (1950) from George Washington University, and Ph. D. (1954) from the University of Minnesota. Dr. Hoyt has served teacher and guidance roles in the public schools and a variety of professional roles in several universities. He joined the staff of the College of Education, University of Maryland, in 1969 from which he is presently on leave of absence. In the spring of 1974, Dr. Hoyt was confirmed by the United States Senate as the associate commissioner, Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education.

Dr. Hoyt served as a member of the Policy and Planning Committee, Guidance Division, American Vocational Association (1969 - 1972); chairman, Commission on Guidance and Vocational Education, National Vocational Guidance Association (1970); member, Task Force on Career Education, American Vocational Association (1971); member, Joint Commission on Guidance and Vocational Education,

American Vocational Association (1972); and chairman, National Guidance Conference, Guidance Division, American Vocational Association (1973).

Dr. Hoyt was honored in 1965 when he received the First Distinguished Service Award from The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. In 1967, Dr. Hoyt received the Professional Recognition Award from the Iowa Personnel and Guidance Association, and in 1969 he was the recipient of the Professional Recognition Award from the Iowa Vocational Association. In 1972, Dr. Hoyt was presented the Outstanding Service Award from the American Vocational Association, and in 1973 was recognized as the Vocational Educator of the Year by the Maryland Vocational Association.

Dr. Hoyt is listed in *Who's Who in America* and in the *Dictionary of International Biography* (1971 - 1972).

He is the author of the following books in addition to numerous monographs, journal articles, and unpublished papers:

Manual for Institutional Self-study of the RSB-Form E Data
Minneapolis: National Computer Systems, 1973
(With G. Mangum, N. Pinson, D. Laramore, and E. Peterson)

Career Education and the Elementary School Teacher
(With G. Mangum, R. Evans, and E. Mackin)

Career Education, What It is and How to Do It

Career Education In the Middle/Junior High School

On behalf of The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, I take considerable pleasure in introducing Dr. Kenneth Hoyt's address concerning a topic of interest to all educators: Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational
and Technical Education

CAREER EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: AN APPROACH TO DEFINING DIFFERENCES

Introduction

Is "Career Education" simply a new name for "Vocational Education?" Should the terms "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education" be considered as synonymous? Apparently, large segments of the general public--and many professional educators--seem to feel that the answer to both questions must be "yes."

Interestingly enough, during the last three years, there has been considerable effort expended proclaiming that the terms "Career Education" and "Vocational Education" are not synonymous while, at the same time, little attention has been paid to what, if any, differences exist in the meanings of "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education." It seems unfortunate that relatively more time appears to have been spent in proclaiming that differences do exist between "Career Education" and "Vocational Education" than in specifying, with exactness, what such differences are. It seems equally unfortunate that, by and large, differences between "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education" have long been ignored. It is time that we face these problems.

It would be fruitless to attempt to differentiate meanings of these three terms by deriving the meaning of each independent of the other two. Some common base must be utilized for purposes of defining each term. Here, an attempt will be made to construct such a base through defining six words that are basic to the controversy. These six words are: (1) "work"; (2) "career"; (3) "vocation"; (4) "occupation"; (5) "leisure"; and (6) "education."

The views expressed here are those of the writer and are, in no way, intended to state or imply any formal position of the United States Office of Education.

Definitions of Basic Terms

"Work" is conscious effort aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others. As such, it is unimportant whether such effort is paid or unpaid in nature. What is important is that it represent the basic need of all human beings to achieve--to accomplish--to do something productive that allows the individual to discover both who he/she is and why he/she is. With this definition, work is properly viewed as a human right--not as a societal obligation.

"Career" is the totality of work one does in his or her lifetime. Thus, any person can have only one career. That career typically begins prior to entering kindergarten and continues well into the retirement years.

"Vocation" is one's primary work role at any given point in time. Vocations include paid employment, but they also extend to unpaid work roles. For example, we can speak of the "vocation" of the student, the full-time volunteer worker, or the full-time homemaker just as easily as we can speak about the "vocation" of the plumber, the physician, or the engineer.

"Occupation" is one's primary work role in the world of paid employment. Economic returns are always considered among the work values of persons engaged in occupations although these might not be considered at all by persons in certain vocations. The occupations of many persons will be synonymous with their vocations. One can never have an occupation without having a vocation—although, of course, one can have a "vocation" without being engaged in an "occupation."

"Leisure" consists of activities, other than sleeping, in which one engages when not performing in his or her vocation. Thus, "leisure" holds possibilities for both "work" and for "play."

"Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns. As such, it is obviously a lifelong process and considerably broader in meaning than the term "schooling."

All that follows here is based on an assumption that these six basic terms are understood and agreed upon. Those who disagree with one or more of these definitions will necessarily find themselves disagreeing with the remainder of this presentation.

Defining "Career Education," and "Vocational Education," and "Occupational Education"

"Career Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. As such, it makes no restrictions in meaning whether one speaks about the work of the homemaker, the musician, the lawyer, or the bricklayer. Some work will require advanced college degress while other work may require no formal schooling of any kind. To the extent that work is judged "successful," it does typically--and, in these times, increasingly--require some learned set of vocational skills.

"Vocational Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about a primary work role. This definition includes all kinds of primary work roles--paid and unpaid--those assumed by high school dropouts and by university graduates--those taking place in formal classrooms and in on-the-job settings. It differs markedly from the definition of this term currently in use by The American Vocational Association. It is advanced here, not to create controversy, but simply because, with the specific word definitions presented earlier, it seems proper.

"Occupational Education" consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns to work in the world of paid employment. As such, it places a primary emphasis on economic benefits from work that are not necessarily present in either "Vocational Education" or in "Career Education." As with the term "Vocational Education," the term "Occupational Education" obviously includes schooling requiring collegiate degrees as well as schooling at below the baccalaureate level.

With these three generic definitions, it becomes clear that "Occupational Education" always includes "Vocational Education," but "Vocational Education" is not always limited to "Occupational Education." It becomes equally clear that "Career Education," while including both "Vocational Education" and "Occupational Education," extends beyond both in that it may involve work performed as part of one's leisure time. The three terms imply progressive narrowing of purpose. That is, "Career Education" includes all work, "Vocational Education" is limited to all primary work roles, and "Occupational Education" is further limited to all primary work roles in the world of paid employment.

Vocational Education: Bedrock for Career Education

At this point, it seems desirable to move beyond the definitional game-playing to the task of conceptualizing Vocational Education as part of Career Education. The primary point to be made here is that, while Vocational Education can exist without Career Education, there is no way Career Education can exist without Vocational Education. This statement requires some further explanation.

In a societal sense, the goals of Career Education are to help all individuals (1) want to work; (2) acquire the skills necessary for work in these times; and (3) engage in work that is satisfying to the individual and meaningful to society. Since, by definition, "primary" work roles encompass most of the work carried out in the world, Vocational Education, as defined here, becomes a central ingredient for skill acquisition--and thus a major part of the Bedrock for the Career Education Movement.

In an individualistic sense, the goals of Career Education are to make work (1) possible; (2) meaningful; and (3) satisfying to each individual. Work, in these times, is increasingly impossible unless one has been equipped with a set of vocational skills that will qualify him or her for work. Further, it is obvious that work can become neither "meaningful" nor "satisfying" unless and until it is first "possible." Again, then, we can clearly see the Bedrock necessity for Vocational Education, as defined here, for the seccess of the Career Education movement.

Finally, when one recognizes that, in the foreseeable future, more than eighty percent of all occupations will require the acquisition of vocational skills at less than the baccalaureate level, it is obvious that what has been the prime emphasis of traditional Vocational Education--i.e., providing occupational skills at the sub-baccalaureate level--must be greatly expanded if career education is to succeed. Some have pictured "Career Education" as a subterfuge for expanding Vocational Education. It would be much more accurate to recognize that, far from being a subterfuge, Career Education must <u>demand</u> major expansion of occupational skill training at the sub-baccalaureate level. It is simply essential to successful implementation of the Career Education concept itself.

Implications for Change in Vocational Education in Academic Settings

From the beginning, advocates of Career Education have called for the complete integration of Vocational Education into the total fabric of American education-- for the fusion of what have been academic education, general education, and vocational education into a single system that emphasizes preparation for work as one of the major goals of the total educational structure. The implications of this objective require some examination.

Some vocational educators have seemed to interpret "integration" to mean that academic teachers will change in ways that make them more like today's vocational educators. Others seem to believe that "integration" means that traditional academic teachers will come to like traditional Vocational Education teachers better--and vice versa. In short, that both will somehow adjust in ways that help them relate better with each other. It seems important to point out that the best that can be hoped for in a mutual adjustment situation is accommodation of different persons to one another. "Accommodation" implies adjustment without the necessity for basic changes in either party. "Integration," on the other hand, implies basic changes in both parties. Career Education stands squarely for integration--not for simple accommodation.

The integration called for by Career Education demands that academic teachers change their internal value systems and their operational behavior in ways that reflect the importance of education as preparation for work. We ask all academic teachers to recognize preparation for work as one, among several, of the basic goals of American education. This will require major internal changes in many of today's academic teachers.

This hoped for integration also calls for fundamental internal changes in today's Vocational Education teachers. Integration cannot occur in an atmosphere of protective isolationism. The separateness of traditional Vocational Education which, in the past, has seemed essential for survival, must, if Career Education's goals are to be attained, be abandoned. Instead, today's vocational educators must strive to find and to emphasize the commonality of purpose in education as preparation for work that binds them with all other educators into a single family of professionals.

To emphasize commonality of purposes is in no way to say that uniqueness will disappear. Rather, it is simply to recognize the importance of the commonalities. An emphasis on uniqueness will always be important to the individualistic goals of each educator. Vocational educators of today have two basic choices with respect to proclaiming their uniqueness. One would be to emphasize "Vocational Education" as preparation for primary work roles--paid or unpaid--at the sub-baccalaureate degree level. This would necessitate abandonment of the traditional criterion applied in defining a program as "Vocational Education" that stipulates that it should lead to gainful employment. To do so would immediately make industrial arts, as a curriculum area, part of Vocational Education. It would also legitimize, as part of Vocational Education, large parts of the work of today's home economics and vocational agriculture teachers that are not necessarily concerned only about paid employment. It would make vocational exploratory experiences for all students--including the so-called "college bound"--a basic and bonafide part of Vocational Education. Certainly, it would call for major changes in what has traditionally been called "Vocational Education" in secondary schools and in post-secondary educational settings.

A second alternative would be to move from "Vocational Education" to "Occupational Education" in labeling the field. If this were to be done, it would probably be accompanied, for purposes of emphasizing uniqueness, on preparation for gainful employment in occupations requiring preparation at less than the baccalaureate degree level. It can be seen that, while involving a change in terminology, this would necessitate very little change in job functioning on the part of most of today's vocational educators.

There are, of course, a number of additional alternatives open to today's vocational educator. Among these are the following: (a) keep Vocational Education "as is," ignore Career Education, and hope that Career Education will go away; (b) keep Vocational Education essentially "as is," but encourage large increases in support for career guidance in hopes that career guidance personnel will take care of the integration problem; or (c) keep Vocational Education essentially "as is" in the senior high school, but support career awareness and career exploratory programs at the elementary and junior high school levels.

Even these few examples will, hopefully, serve to illustrate the basic problem Career Education asks today's vocational educators to face--namely, the problem of deciding to change. To date, the

problem has not been very squarely faced by either Vocational Education or by Career Education personnel.

Career Education's Need for Support by Vocational Education

Finally, I want to conclude by commenting briefly on the urgent need of Career Education for support by today's professional Vocational Education community. Prior to doing so, it seems important to point out that Career Education, as a total movement, holds far greater potential for change than could be expected to result from the isolated efforts of any single part of education--such as Vocational Education. Remember, the broad goal of Career Education is to bring both prominence and permanence to education as preparation for work as a major goal of our entire system of education. Had Vocational Education been able to do this by itself, I think it would have done so years ago. That is, Career Education and Vocational Education need each other.

But it is change that we have been speaking of here. The art of compromise, essential for moving toward change, cannot effectively be accomplished if Career Education is controlled or directed by Vocational Education. Vocational Education was certainly one of the parents of Career Education. We must, however, recognize that, if we continue with the analogy, that Career Education is a child born out of wedlock. The true marriage between Vocational and academic education has yet to take place. If such a marriage is ever to occur, it must result, in part, because both "parents" respect and admire what this child called "Career Education" has been able to accomplish. Neither "parent" can control if this is to occur.

Career Education is a healthy child today as witnessed by the hundreds of local school systems that have initiated Career Education programs on their own. But it is a child and, as such, in great need of both nourishment and assistance in moving toward maturity. As one of its "parents," Vocational Education has, it seems to me, a continuing responsibility to financially support and provide thoughtful input into the continuing conceptualization of Career Education. It would be a tragic mistake to see Vocational Education's interest in and support for Career Education diminished at this point in time.

Concluding Remarks

The Career Education movement calls for major internal changes on the part of both the academic and the vocational educators of today. It would be unwise and unproductive for one to change unless the other also moved toward change. Change, if it comes, will be slow and painful for all concerned. If all of us can change in a Career Education direction, American education will become more meaningful and more appropriate for our students. There is a choice, to be sure. There is also a deep professional responsibility.

HOYT LECTURE QUESTIONS

1. What is your definition of leisure?

You can see my current definition in the body of the paper. I must admit that I am dissatisfied with this definition and am seeking help in making it better. It is vital, in my opinion, that the definition of "leisure" be stated in such a way that it can accommodate the option of using part of one's leisure time in work. This is important for two reasons. First, if leisure time increases, as most seem to be predicting, it will be societally important that people view "leisure" as something that is not synonymous with "play." Second, because many people will find themselves unable to experience the psychological meaningfulness of work, as I have defined that term, through their paid employment, it is necessary to make it conceptually possible for one to experience the personal meaning and meaningfulness of work as part of one's leisure time. If I can arrive at a better definition of "leisure," perhaps I can make these two concerns clear in the new definition I hope to be able to formulate.

2. What kinds of changes are you looking for in that "parent" of career education that we call "academic education?"

Basically, I am hoping that all educators can accept and endorse education as preparation for work as both a prominent and a permanent goal of American education. This is going to require basic, internal attitudinal changes on the part of many of today's so-called "academic educators" who, like some of their students, still regard "work" as a dirty four letter word. It means moving away from a point of view that holds the primary purpose of education to be that of preparing students for still more education. It means rejection of the notion that only courses and programs labeled as "vocational education" are concerned with readying students for work. It means acceptance of the proposition that any course can, for one or more of its students, properly be regarded as "vocational education" if, in the eyes of the student, its basic purpose is preparation for a primary work role. Further, it means acceptance of the notion that there are career implications present in almost every course that is taught. Now, by that, I certainly do NOT mean that everything that is taught has

career implications. After all, "education as preparation for work" is properly regarded as only ONE of the goals of American education—certainly not as the ONLY goal nor, for any given teacher or student at any particular point in time, as necessarily the major or the most important goal. Neither would I deny any liberal arts college, for example, the right to contend that education as preparation for work is not included among their goals. All I have said to such institutions is that they owe it to the students who attend such institutions (and the parents of those students who are paying the bill) to say so if this is the case.

3. Your goals for career education sound like functions. Are they?

Not to me. To me, the word "functions" implies methodological implications. Just as "functions" lead to "methodologies" so, in my opinion, do "goals" lead to "objectives." It is simply a way of thinking about things.

4. What about a fourth goal of "adoption" for career education?

I don't know what that means. I suspect that, perhaps, I am placing under the goal of making work "possible" some of what you mean by "adoption." To me, in order for work to become "possible," one must have the ability to choose, to change, and to adapt in addition to the competence required to secure a needed set of vocational skills.

5. Who should control or direct career education?

I do not see career education as a matter of "turfmanship." Rather, I have often pictured it as involving the collaborative efforts of the formal educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional community, and the home and family structure aimed at clarifying relationships between education and work as well as making work a more meaningful part of the total life-style of people. Who should direct it? All three of these elements should have a voice or we cannot truly label it as a "collaborative" effort. The person who "directs" it should, in my opinion, be called a "coordinator" rather than a "director." To me, that person may be a former academic classroom teacher, vocational educator, counselor, curriculum specialist, administrator, or someone who came from the business-labor-industry-professional community. True, someone is going to have to "ramrod" the program wherever it exists. At the same time, the success of the career education movement is, in my opinion, directly dependent on it being the collaborative effort of many people.

6. With the definition of "work" that you gave, how can we handle a question, like, "Isn't ALL education career education?"

I simply do not believe that all education is career education. Because the goals of career education extend to all parts of education making such goals no different than any other basic goals of American education. Because one's career influences his or her total life-style is no reason for saying that "all education is career education"—using that kind of reasoning, one might as well say that "all education is sex education"—and who would want to say that?

7. What about worker alienation?

As I read the literature on worker alienation, it strikes me that one could conceptualize "alienated workers" into two broad categories, one of which we could call the "over-educated" and the other the "under-educated" worker. (Please don't worry now about whether or not it is proper to consider that anyone is truly "over-educated" because that gets us in a philosophical quandry that drags us away from the basic issues.) I like to make an analogy between the "over-educated" and the "under-educated" worker on the industrial assembly line and those on the "educational assembly line" that we call "students." In this analogy, the "over-educated" student is one who already knows what the teacher is trying to teach—and that student is bored. The "under-educated" student is one who cannot possibly learn what the teacher is trying to teach—and that student is frustrated. Whether the cause is boredom or frustration, the result—i.e., the "alienated worker"—is exactly the same. I can apply this same kind of analogy to the "over-educated" and the "under-educated" teachers in our classrooms. I think the problem of the "over-educated" teacher is particularly serious. In my opinion, we have a very large number of teachers in our schools today who are considerably brighter, more innovative, and more creative than their structured job assignments allow them to be. Career education, in a very real sense, tries to recognize this by freeing both teachers and students to be as bright, innovative, and creative as they really are. If we can reduce "worker alienation" among both teachers and students through career education, the result, at least theoretically, should be greater productivity on the part of both. This means teachers will teach better and students will learn more. To me, this is a crucial part of the basic rationale for career education and one that has received insufficient emphasis. I have expanded on this in my book entitled *Career Education for Gifted and Talented Students.*

8. Did you purposefully by-pass the belief that "vocational as a calling" is realistic?

Yes. I do not deny the need for each individual to find a personal morality in work, but I seriously doubt if all persons can find this personal morality in their vocation—or in their occupation. For many persons, the personal morality of work will, it seems to me, have to be gained in work performed as part of one's leisure time. By "personal morality," I am referring to the human need of all human beings to feel that they are someone because they have accomplished something—that someone needs them for something—that it does matter that they exist—that, because they exist, the world is, in some way and to some degree, better off. To me, the meaning of work must embrace both the societal obligation and the personal morality concepts. The more I ponder the concept, the more I find myself thinking about career education in what must be regarded as humanistic terms. In doing so, I am in no way avoiding the societal requirements that make for our world of paid employment. Rather, I am only trying to say that the world of career education extends beyond that world of paid employment.

9. What evidence do we have that cognitive learning and skill development have increased as a result of career education vs. traditional learning as measured on STANDARDIZED TESTS?

The available data are mixed. Positive examples of differences, on standardized achievement tests favoring students exposed to a career education mode of teaching as opposed to those not so exposed, have been reported, at the K-6 level, in Santa Barbara, California, in Lincoln County, West Virginia, and in Dade County (Miami), Florida. On the other hand, the finding of "no statistically significant differences" is being heard in other places—a recent report on evaluation of career education in Minnesota is a good example of this. I'm sorry to say that I haven't seen similar kinds of evidence at either the junior or at the senior high school levels. (That doesn't mean, of course, that evidence doesn't exist.) I'm sure that increases in basic academic achievement is a criterion we definitely will have to use, at least at the K-6 level, in assessing the effectiveness of career education. I hope that, as we use this criterion, we will be able to do so also keeping in mind variabilities in the total instructional process which, as you well know, go considerably beyond the motivational utility of the career education approach.

10. What about future funding for career education?

As of today, the Congress has yet to appropriate one penny specifically earmarked for career education. The primary source of USOE funds for career education has come from vocational education funds. Those funds are currently in the process of being substantially reduced—and I'm in agreement that they should be. I am highly hopeful that, in FY 75, we will have some funds, either under the Cooperative Research Act or under the Senate's new Career Education Bill, that are specifically earmarked for career education. If we get funds under either of these possibilities, those funds will be somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 million. This hopefully will allow us to exert some effort toward improving the quality of existing K-12 career education programs, to begin the movement toward expanding the variety of settings in which career education operates, and to work in a more concentrated fashion on evaluating the effectiveness of career education. Funds of that magnitude will not be sufficient to really deliver career education, on an effective scale, to special segments of the population such as poor people, minorities, the handicapped, the gifted and talented, nor that needed to face the special career education problems of females. For such special groups, career education has been, to date, largely a matter of over-promise and under-delivery. I don't know what the prospects are of securing sufficient funds to do career education on a really comprehensive basis. My personal feeling is that, to the greatest possible extent, this should be a matter of state and local effort and not the result of a massive new amount of funds from a big, new Career Education Act. I don't want to see the federal government "bribe" schools and communities to engage in career education. Rather, I would hope such places would undertake career education efforts on their own because they know it is needed. I think this is already happening to a greater extent than most people seem inclined to admit or recognize.

11. Someone must control the reins of funding for career education—must they not?

You are referring to what I said in the speech about the necessity for vocational education to give up total control of career education programs at the state and local level. What I am trying to say to vocational educators is "LET LOOSE BUT DON'T LET GO." Now, I recognize that, in order to do so, a whole new way of thinking will be required for most vocational educators. Vocational education has been effectively "locked out" of the broad arena of educational decision-making ever since it started in 1917. The really big and broad policy decisions in running particular school systems have

traditionally been made by people from the so-called "academic community " As a result, vocational education has been forced to operate largely with special funds and often under special administrative positions. This has created a schism between members of the vocational education community and the traditional "academic educators." They are distrustful of each other. What I am trying to say is that neither group can "control" career education and have the other group accept it. The expertise of vocational educators will be absolutely essential in making career education work in all of education. Just as the expertise of vocational education is required for the long run success of career education, so, too, is the expertise of the humanists, the liberal arts advocates, and the academic specialties. On top of this, we must recognize that career education calls for going beyond the confines of formal education and extending into a collaborative effort involving both the business-labor-industry-professional community and the home and family structure. Before going beyond the formal education system, it will be necessary to attain integration of efforts within our educational system. I see career education as a "coming together" effort—one that will involve some change, some give-and-take on both sides. Above all, it will take cooperative decision-making in which the expertise of all involved is both recognized and utilized. I hope we can join together in our common concern for making career education work—a concern that goes beyond who will control it or who will get credit for it.